



## **REMARKS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-17 remain in the application. Claims 18-30 have been cancelled. Claims 1-11 have been allowed and will not be discussed further herein. Claims 13-17 have been indicated to include allowable subject matter and also will not be discussed further herein.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,445,587 to Hillman (hereinafter Hillman). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Hillman is directed to a cooling system for the internal combustion engine of a motorcycle. The cooling system includes a radiator and means defining air passages each having a forwardly facing inlet opening disposed respectively on the opposite sides of the motorcycle's front fork. Each air passage extends rearwardly from the inlet opening to an outlet which opens into a plenum chamber disposed adjacent the radiator. The cross-sectional area of each passage increases gradually between its inlet and outlet ends. An exhaust duct is connected to the plenum chamber and the radiator is disposed between the plenum chamber and the exhaust duct. Figs. 1 and 2 of Hillman are reproduced herein.



Hillman does not disclose a radiator mounted to a frame and disposed between the engine and the rear wheel where the radiator is positioned such that an uppermost portion of the radiator is disposed at a lower level than an uppermost portion of the rear wheel as required. Rather, Hillman lacks both a written and graphical description of the spatial relationship between the radiator and rear wheel. Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 reproduced above do not define a spatial relationship between the rear wheel

and radiator and the text of the specification does not either. The Examiner simply states that Hillman discloses all of the features of claim 12, providing nothing more than reference to Figs. 1 and 2. Applicant respectfully requests additional clarification of the rejection in view of what is disclosed by the cited reference. Applicant believes disclosure of the features of the invention as claimed in claim 12 is not provided by Hillman and as a result, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. HRA-14911.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By   
James A. Balazs, Reg. No. 47401

4080 Erie Street  
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7836  
(216) 566-9700